



# *The* **UNabridged**

THE CONCORDIA STUDENT UNION NEWSLETTER

**NO POSTING**

**DÉFENSE  
D’AFFICHER**

**By Order of the Dean of Students!**

**October • 2001**



# CSU President Resigns

## Over Administration Meddling

On Monday, October 15th, 2001 CSU President Sabrina Stea informed the Chair of Council of her resignation from office and brought forward a letter of resignation at the October 18th CSU Council meeting. Stea resigned citing "interference in internal student union affairs by the Concordia University administration" as her main reason for resigning.

This means that there will be new elections in late November, and a massive political showdown to determine who will be elected to the student union. The elections are for the 26th-28th of November.

Monday, October 15th, 2001

To the CSU Council of Representatives and the students of Concordia,

I am informing you that as of 5:00pm today, I am resigning as President of the Concordia Student Union. My resignation is motivated by two reasons; first, I want to make clear that our student union can no longer tolerate the interference in internal student union affairs by the Concordia University administration. The second, that a new presidential election will be an opportunity for open debate and will encourage the wider membership to get involved in a direct way. An election will help clear the air of the misinformation being spread regarding the CSU.

In March 2001, I ran as President of the student union and won more votes than the two runners up combined with the second highest voter turnout in the CSU's history. My slate was open and forthcoming about its political orientation and made it clear that throughout our term we would fight for democracy, accessibility and human rights at home and abroad. The administration, however, has steadily played a direct and manipulative role in seeking to undermine the student union by downplaying the mandate we had won from the student body.

As a university student, I strongly believe in the power and responsibility that students have within society to challenge the status quo. I think that it is ridiculous to claim that the Union should not be political. I believe it should act as a platform from which issues should be put forward, debated and more importantly acted upon. Universities have traditionally been a safe space for debates no matter how controversial, and students have a history of standing up and taking progressive stances. However, the Concordia administration, elected by no one and accountable only to the profit-making interest, has over the course of the past five months embarked upon an ever-escalating campaign of interference into the workings of the CSU. It has done this because administrators are afraid of the political positions that our members have taken in democratically conducted student wide elections and referenda which have been critical of their policies and governance, the growing privatization of university, and the human rights violations committed around the world.

During the course of my mandate, members of the university administration, including Dr. Lowy, have been complicit in:

- the arbitrary expulsion and banning from campus of two duly elected union representatives, Tom Keefer and Laith Marouf.
- the interference in the September 26th general assembly by telling students how to vote through the instructions of the Dean of Engineering and faculty members.
- the blatant refusal of university space and facilities to student groups as well as the banning of postering on campus, impeding any and all direct communication with our membership.
- the tacit support of B'nai Brith's disgusting comments regarding the CSU handbook and its "terrorist" nature and its purported links to Osama Bin Laden.
- the calling of an investigation of the CSU merely based on CSU-published articles criticising corporations, on a fraud that occurred under a previous CSU executive and on a controversial student agenda.

I freely acknowledge the fact that students may take issue with the CSU's political positions, and that they have problems that they would like addressed. Nevertheless, I believe that during my time as President, the CSU has been completely successful in raising important issues and we have given space and visibility to the marginalized voices on campus and in society and we take pride in that.

The CSU is a democratic and accountable organization, and arguably the most democratic institution on campus. Any and all students can run for executive or council and vote in our elections, referenda and general assemblies. Students are the ones that should determine the policy and positions of their student union, not the university administration. I can no longer tolerate this undermining of my mandate and of students' rights to run their own affairs. I am resigning in order to bring these matters to public attention and in order to allow students an opportunity to openly debate their differences and to emerge from a new electoral process with a strong and united Student Union. And I do not rule out the possibility of running for re-election.

For the past 5 years, I have been involved in various university-bodies and in other student organizations. As a Fine Arts student and as President of the CSU, I have always fought for the interests of students by raising concerns about human rights, the role of education in society and about the dangers of corporatization and privatization in the education field. This struggle is what a university education is about. I will continue to do so following my resignation from the CSU presidency and hope that that tradition will be upheld.

In solidarity,  
Sabrina Stea

## WELCOME TO THE OCTOBER UNABRIDGED


If your wondering why this month's issue of the CSU newsletter is a little late, you haven't been following the mainstream media. It's been non-stop fun around the CSU offices lately: first, B'nai Brith proposes that the CSU may be linked to bin Laden; second, the petition-toting runner-up from last year's election decided all he needed to win was an election right now. All the while, the University Administration has been pulling one stunt after another: banning postering on campus; refusing space to student groups; and trying to have the CSU investigated for treason (ha!), having opinions, and creating "controversy" (oops!). It all seemed like a barrel of laughs, until our president announced her resignation.

Sabrina, barefoot president of the Concordia Student Union, will be dearly missed by her fellow executive members, councilors, CSU staff, and supporters. Her smiling face, her patience and commitment, her politics, and her guts (oh and

her punctuality!) made her an important and special part of the CSU. She'll be sticking around though, because Concordia's got a long way to go, and we all love hearing her laugh along the way. Sabrina's been involved throughout her time at Concordia, fighting for free education, student involvement, and human rights locally and globally. Keep your eyes open, we all hope to see her running in the coming election, she's committed to continuing the struggle for free speech and critical thinking on campus.

Viva la principessa!

Your CSU executive,  
Patrice, Genevieve, Laith, Marina, and Benoit





# Administration Interferes in Student Initiatives

By the CSU Executive

There has been a lot of hype of late about how a group of "radicals" have somehow taken over the student union. With all of the fuss, you may not have noticed some big changes on campus. These changes are not the product of a radical student union. They are the work of the Concordia University administration.

The fact that the Concordia administration is screwing students over is not really news to anyone who pays the outrageous fees that it charges, or to anyone who sits in an over-crowded classroom, or to anyone who got a gander at the huge pay increase administrators so generously gave themselves, or to anyone that spends hours in line to wade through a confusing bureaucratic maze, or to anyone who has gone through the trouble of jumping through the hoops that we must jump through to get a refund for fees that are illegal in the first place, and so on. But we digress.

The administration's newest attack on students directly affects your ability to organize independently and to criticize future Concordia policy. How will students be able to develop independent policy alternatives if the administration is constantly meddling in the affairs of the independent bodies that students have to represent them - like the Concordia Student Union?

While students were looking the other way, the Rector appropriated the right to expel elected student representatives without any form of due process. Tom Keefer and Laith Marouf are known to have criticized the state of Israel for its violation of Palestinian human rights. They have also criticized the administration for the huge pay increases it gave itself while inventing new fees to charge students. As Rector Lowy argued in the pages of the Montreal Gazette, their actions have led to the "overt politicization of the university".

Marouf and Keefer's actions are, no doubt, "political". But are they illegal? If not, then why kick them out? This is an extremely dangerous precedent for future student representatives. If the Rector can kick them out without due process, he can kick out any student elected to office who says things he disagrees with. Thankfully, after 51 days of banishment, a judge has ruled that the administration was breaking the law in banning Keefer

and Marouf from CSU offices. But the fight is far from over; the legal and political battle over the independence of student unions goes on.

Recently, the student union has produced research that points out the human rights violations that Concordia's corporate partners profit from. In a break from Concordia's tradition of open and democratic debate, the administration has decided to try to stamp out the student publications that are printing such troubling information. All the criticisms published by the CSU are well founded and well documented, but that doesn't seem to matter. The university has not denied the allegations made by the CSU against the companies in question, but it wants a provincial investigation into the CSU anyway. The October 5th announcement on Concordia's web page publicizing the call for an investigation says that it is motivated by the fact that

"CSU publications alleging corporate crimes led several companies to cancel their participation in student job fairs". The University is implying that if the corporations don't like it, it must be illegal!

This year's student agenda is also

mentioned in the October 5th announcement. It appears that telling students about their constitutional rights to assemble and to protest, rigorous criticism of the status quo and encouraging students to fight for free education are also worthy of a provincial investigation. According to the administration's statement, all of this constitutes "incitement to commit illegal acts".

Did you get the day off class to go to the September 26 General Assembly? Only if you were a student in the faculty of Computer Science and Engineering, where the Dean sent directives to all faculty to excuse students from their class to mobilize them to vote down resolutions that were not to his liking. In the e-mail sent by Dean Nabil Esmail obtained by the CSU, the Dean claims that the CSU was bent on "destroying a cornerstone of engineering education." So engineering students got their free Nortel water bottles, and were encouraged to go down to H-110 to save the faculty


from voices critical of their corporate partners. Or, from a different perspective (from the bottom-up), the independence of the student union was violated by administrative interference. Students should be free to decide for themselves what to think about these companies. Administrators should not be telling anyone how to vote, and students of all faculties should have the right to academic amnesty during CSU General Assemblies.

Not all students agree with the actions taken by the CSU executive. Some of them decided to start a petition to use the recall provision in the CSU constitution. The recall mechanism, according to the spirit of the CSU constitution, is meant to be a bottom-up, independent student initiative. The administration violated the independence of the petition initiative by meddling in the process. Administrators have sent unfounded accusations to Concordia employees, including faculty members, who in turn have mobilized their students against the CSU executive. Some have even gone so far as to circulate and speak about the petition in their classes. In the CSU constitution it is perfectly legitimate, even encouraged, for students to gather signatures from their peers. It is, however, a violation of the CSU's independence for faculty and administrators to pressure students into signing petitions. This has turned the petition process from a bottom-up independent student initiative into a top-down initiative co-sponsored by the Concordia administration. Numerous council members suspect that the Concordia administration has illegally provided the student leaders of the petition process with the home addresses of all CSU Council members which were used to send threatening bailiff-delivered letters to them and their families. As the Unabridged goes to press, Concordia's legal Council, Bram Freedman, is investigating the charges made against the administration made by acting President Patrice Blais at the October 19th meeting of Concordia's Senate. If Freedman finds that a University administrator has given confidential student information to the organizers of the petition, it will be up to students to make sure that there are political and legal consequences to the administrator's actions.

Whatever the outcome of the elections, students should use the following weeks of electoral debates to take back their democratic institutions from an unelected administration. Isn't it enough that they rob us of our money? How can we let them rob us of our rights as well?



## UNWANTED



Once believed to be "progressive" and much "hipper," Donald Boisvert is now an overpaid flunky of the Senior Administration.

This unelected university bureaucrat has been spotted around Concordia ordering the tearing down of the posters of student groups, and he is suspected to be behind the putting up vast quantities of "do not poster" posters across campus.

**WARNING:** This man is considered biased against students and **extremely dangerous** to our democratic rights. If you see him do not attempt to apprehend him by yourself. The only way this man can be stopped is through public embarrassment and the mobilization of your fellow students to demand your right to free expression and the right to poster on campus. A REWARD of greater democracy and communication on campus will be won by all students should he cease his regressive behaviour.

## DEAN OF STUDENTS, DR. DONALD BOISVERT





**The CSU Council met the night of Wednesday, Sept. 12th and in the wake of the events in the United States has made this statement to the Concordia community and the world:**

fullest sympathies and condolences to the victims and their friends and families. The CSU undertakes with all the means at its disposal to comfort all those within the Concordia community affected by this horrible event.

We affirm our wish to see those responsible for the massacre brought to justice and we denounce any attempt to place responsibility for the actions of a few upon an entire community, and we will not tolerate any racist acts against Arabs, Muslims or any other ethnic or religious group.

The CSU expresses our profound grief and shock towards the massacre of innocent civilians on Sept. 11th, 2001. We offer our

## Expelled Students win Legal Victory in Provincial Superior Court

by Aaron Maté, CSU Councilor

Laith Marouf and Tom Keefer, two student activists expelled from Concordia University on August 20th, won an important victory in court on Wednesday October 10th, that forced the University Administration to allow them back on Concordia University property. The victory granted by the courts ruling is only the first stage in an ongoing legal injunction filed by the students.

Quebec Provincial Court Judge Israel Mass ruled in the students' favour by compelling the University to allow them access to the CSU offices on the 6th floor of the Hall building. The ruling effectively overturned Rector Frederick Lowy's decision to ban Mr. Keefer and Mr. Marouf from University property. The victory didn't come easily, and was closely argued by the various lawyers. Judge Mass began the court case by wishing to have it noted for the record that his daughter was a personal friend of Bram Freedman (the Chief Legal council of Concordia University) who along with lawyer William Atkinson, were representing the University in the courtroom. Concerned that this might affect the appearance of his impartiality, he asked if the plaintiffs had a problem with him acting as a Judge in this case due to a perceived conflict of interest.

In response to this revelation, Keefer and Marouf stated that they "felt uncomfortable with the case proceeding" under Judge Mass. However, because Keefer and Marouf did not file a procedural motion requesting a new Judge, Judge Mass decided that he would continue to hear the case. Matters then turned to a presentation by the students' lawyer who outlined the substance of an injunction which sought to have Keefer and Marouf returned to campus. Because the case in its entirety could not be heard at that moment, a number of appointments with the court were made over the next two months in order to produce affidavits and cross-examine witnesses.

The case will be heard over the course of several dates in October and November, with a final decision to be rendered by the court in early December. The next court date is October 24th, at the Palais de Justice, 10 St. Antoine Est (corner of St. Antoine and St. Laurent) in downtown Montreal.

Afterwards, Marouf and Keefer expressed their satisfaction at being able to resume their duties as student representatives at the Concordia Student Union. "We finally had our day in court, and we won an important victory for ourselves and the rights of all students at Concordia," said Marouf. Mr. Keefer added that "this ruling is a clear sign that Rector Lowy violated our rights by ignoring the rule of law. We hope that this ruling will encourage him to respect student rights at Concordia and to show some good faith in resolving the issue of our illegal expulsion from Concordia University."

While the university's spokespersons sought to downplay the judge's decision, this was clearly a victory for the students. As Keefer stated: "whatever the University's spin, the fact is that for 51 days we weren't allowed to be on campus to go to our offices, and we are now able to do so today."

The students celebrated their return with a ribbon cutting ceremony on October 11th which was attended by a group of 20-30 students and community members with less than 24 hours notice. Those present listened to Mr. Marouf's and Mr. Keefer's speeches outside of Concordia, and then joined them in a procession up to the 6th floor CSU offices, where another ribbon across the office doors was cut.



**Students need space.**





**So you need to  
contact the CSU?**

**Concordia Student Union  
1455 de Maisonneuve Ouest  
Suite H-637,  
Montreal, PQ H3G 1M8**

**Telephone:  
514.848.7474  
Fax: 514.848.7450  
mail: [csu@csu.tao.ca](mailto:csu@csu.tao.ca)**



**[Http://www.csu.tao.ca](http://www.csu.tao.ca)**

## **Administration should be held accountable**

**By Patrice Blais, VP-Finance and acting CSU President**

On October 5th 2001, Concordia University Rector Frederick Lowy sent a letter to three different ministers of the Quebec government calling for them to investigate the CSU. This unprecedented aggressive move by the university even went so far as to suggest that the Quebec government should take legal action to dissolve the CSU as a corporate entity. Rector Lowy is not only attacking the student union executive but also trying to fulfill his wider objective of getting rid of an annoying student union that gets in the way of the university administration's agenda.

The letter refers to various legal provisions that in one case has no jurisprudence since its adoption in 1704 and in the other case has not been used since the Great Depression in the 1930's. The university administration is attempting to get the government to do their dirty work for them. They could request the dissolution of the student union themselves but they know that they would face outrage and a large mobilization on campus. We cannot be blind to what the university is trying to accomplish. They claim that they want the student union to be accountable and they justify their actions on the basis of "the greater good of the students," but they themselves have forgotten the meaning of "the greater good of the students".

The university administration is so corrupt that they even refuse to be accountable to their own Board of Governors. They are refusing to release information to members of the Board of Governors because they decided that the members in question would not use the information for the good of the university. This shows quite clearly that whoever doesn't agree with the administration will be marginalized. Students once again are discriminated against in this university even at the very top of the ladder of university governance.

Dr. Lowy should investigate his own backyard before giving lessons to the student union. In fact, we would really find out what it means for Concordia's reputation to be tarnished if the government decided to start investigating the administration. Rector Lowy would undoubtedly resign before such an eventuality, since the results would probably send him into involuntary early retirement.

## **The Admin Fee and Capital Campaign Fee**

**By David Bernans, CSU Researcher**

**illegal taxes on knowledge**

**Why is the bill that you pay to the Concordia administration so much higher (in the neighbourhood of \$300 higher) than the bill you would have paid five years ago? Isn't there a tuition freeze?**

**Yes there is a tuition freeze. Yes you are paying more. And, yes it is illegal!**

In the mid-1990s annual funding from the provincial government to universities fell by over \$300 million. Initially, the shortfall was to be made up through tuition increases. This attempt to download spending cuts onto the backs of students ran up against stiff resistance in the form of student strikes, occupations and direct actions. In 1996, the Ministry of Education (MEQ) was forced to freeze tuition.

Each university was therefore left to its own devices to deal with the problem of declining revenues from the provincial government. Some universities, like UQAM and Laval, courageously refused to download costs onto the backs of students. Since they also refused to sacrifice quality of education by cutting staff or services, these universities ran deficits.

Other universities, like McGill and Concordia, had less political backbone. They took what they called a "fiscally responsible" approach of violating the tuition freeze won by students and sacrificing accessibility of education. They started charging "backdoor tuition" (a term Rector Frederick Lowy himself used in an uncharacteristic burst of honesty back in 1999) in the form of new fees they invented out of thin air.

The two most onerous fees at Concordia have been the administrative fee (now \$9 per credit) and the capital campaign fee (now \$2 per credit).

### **Student Consultation and other myths**

We expect the millionaires that dominate the Board of Governors to impose new fees. What do they know about being a poor student? How many CEOs have you seen lined up at the People's Potato for a free meal?

But the University claims that the capital campaign fee is a "donation" (do you remember getting a tax credit for your capital campaign contribution?). The admin says that students are voluntarily giving their money to the University.

In point of fact, the only referendum that has ever been held on the issue resulted in an overwhelming defeat for the fee. About 90 per cent of students voted to axe the fee last spring.

So how can the administration claim that the capital campaign fee is a voluntary contribution? Apparently, students were "consulted" before the fee was introduced. The fee was approved by the Concordia Council on Student Life (CCSL) - a group which includes some appointed student representatives and some administrators. Does approval by such a committee really constitute consultation? The only form of consultation recognized by the constitution of the CSU is university-wide referendum (CSU by-law 13). This is the only way available under our constitution to charge a student initiated fee levy. And the capital campaign fee failed this test miserably.

It is hard to say exactly where all of your money goes. With the

capital campaign fee, all that we really know is that your money goes to a private corporation called the Concordia Foundation. We asked the Foundation what it did with your money but it refused to tell us. Since it

**But don't these  
fees pay for  
student services?**

is a private corporation, the Foundation is not required to disclose anything about its financial operations. The Foundation invests your money (who knows where) and spends it how ever it sees fit. The investment and spending decisions are taken by a board of directors that has plenty of corporate representation and not one student.

The money from the administrative fee, like all revenue, goes into the general operating budget of the University. It is very easy for the university administration to say that this money goes to important services (and it is easy to make the veiled threat that removing these fees will be pulling the plug on our own education). Don't believe the hype.

Students didn't believe the administration when it said pulling Zoom Media Inc. ads from Concordia public washrooms would create an insoluble revenue crisis for the recycling plan. And low and behold, when the ads were nixed, the University miraculously "found" the money elsewhere.

**But where will  
the money come  
from?**

Concordia is receiving massive injections of money from the provincial government as part of its new

"performance contract" with the MEQ. The CSU suggested that the University set performance targets on accessibility (through fee reductions) to be included in the contract. The University refused. If students unite and fight the fees, the University may be forced to reconsider its refusal to value accessibility of education.

Ultimately, of course, ensuring adequate funding for public education depends on Quebec-wide and Canada-wide public demands for an end to insane corporate tax breaks and public spending cuts. Your student union is committed to working with other community groups to this end, but we need your help. Fill-out your opt-out forms, get them in, and most of all, get active in your union!





# Afghanistan Already Devastated Before Attacks

by Aaron Maté, CSU Councilor

At this point, we cannot know the full impact of the U.S.-led bombings and missile strikes on Afghanistan, but a few things are clear. Whatever the final toll of human loss may be, we already know that much misery was caused even before the attacks began. On Sept. 16, New York Times correspondent John F. Burns reported from Pakistan that "Washington has also demanded a cutoff of fuel supplies and the elimination of truck convoys that provide much of the food and other supplies to Afghanistan's civilian population." This order was quickly followed, receiving scant commentary in the Western press.

We can only speculate on the misery and death toll that Washington's demands have caused for the 6 million Afghans that the United Nations World Food Programme (UNWFP) estimates require food aid.

What is certain, to quote the UNWFP, is that Afghanistan was in "a major food crisis" even before our war on terror cut off their main source of food supplies, and that this situation could now mean "a humanitarian crisis of massive proportions." The bombing has forced the UNWFP, among other aid agencies, to drastically reduce their food deliveries to Afghanistan.

Of course, as London Times correspondent Martin Fletcher pointed out in the Oct. 9 Montreal Gazette, "Not all the U.S. war planes involved in Operation Enduring Freedom are raining death and destruction on Afghanistan. Some are bombarding the starving Afghan people with canary yellow food packets labeled: 'This is a food gift from the people of the United States of America.'"

The widely praised "humanitarian relief effort" dropped 37,500 daily rations of food on the country during the first week of bombing, which, doing the simple math, and assuming that all are found, corresponds to feeding one of every 200 hundred people that need them. It is for such reasons that Medecin Sans Frontieres (MSF), an international medical aid group that has worked in Afghanistan for over two decades, called the air drops "a purely propaganda tool, of little real value to the Afghan people." Aside from its obvious transparency, it also has the potential to be harmful. As U.S. officials have openly conceded, they have little idea of where the food drops are going. In a country riddled with land mines after over two decades of conflict and civil war, this poses a serious danger to those venturing out to locate them.

Nonetheless, these are issues of little concern to those cause inflicting the damage, even when brought to their attention by aid agencies. On Oct. 15, Reuters reported that Jean Ziegler, the UN's Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food "called for an end to the bombing of Afghanistan, saying it put the lives of millions of civilians at risk." He told reporters that "The bombing has to stop right now. There is a humanitarian emergency. In winter the lorries cannot go in any more. Millions of Afghans will be unreachable in winter and winter is coming very, very soon." He concluded by repeating the need for a halt

in the attacks because "we must give the (humanitarian) organisations a chance to save the millions of people who are internally displaced (inside Afghanistan)." These pleas were instantly rejected, with British Foreign Secretary Jack Straw explaining to reporters on October 17 that: "We are taking action so that we can provide a much better future for the people of Afghanistan," -- those people who, presumably,

will survive the U.S.-U.K. bombings of their towns and villages and the blockade of the food relief that keeps them alive.

We can also be certain, if we are to believe the CIA, that we are carrying out these acts knowing they may well contribute to "a '100 percent chance' of further terrorist attacks on the United States," as John Ibbitson reported in the Oct. 10 Globe and Mail, citing leaked intelligence reports.

As a side note, we can also observe how the incredible resources and energy being put into the destruction of a starving and desolate country come at a time when many other areas of the world are in need of dire assistance. World Bank head president James D. Wolfensohn announced on October 2 that "As many as 40,000 children under the age of five will die," - mostly from easily preventable diseases - "and some 10 million more people will be condemned to poverty because of the terrorist attacks in the US on September 11", due in large part to the decline in capital flows into the developing world. He concluded by noting that "we have to be conscious of the need for global stability when there is such inequity in the world because the conquest of poverty is also the quest for peace." A few weeks later, UN agencies released reports estimating that 100,000 people are dying of hunger and its effects each day, and that more than 300 million children,

most of them girls, suffer from chronic hunger and malnutrition.

While the answers to such broader problems may take some thought, it is not difficult to think of alternatives to what we have chosen for Afghanistan. One would be to simply follow international law, as embedded in the UN Charter, which the United States' own constitution recognizes as "the supreme law of the land," entrusting the task to the UN Security Council, whose role it is to deal with such matters.

Another option, already foregone, would have been to negotiate with the Taliban, who had offered to hand over bin Laden if the West could supply evidence against him, and release the eight Western missionaries arrested by the regime. The sincerity of their offer will never be known because as Noam Chomsky points out "the West simply dismissed them, preferring to bomb."

These seem far more reasonable than continuing with the campaign aptly described by Znet ([www.zmag.org](http://www.zmag.org)) political analyst Michael Albert:

"We take access to food away from millions and then give food back to tens of thousands while bombing the country into panic and dissolution. This is terrorism, attacks on civilians to gain political ends with a patina of public relations."

We are doing so solely on the pretext that the targeted country has harbored suspected terrorists, and thus should be bombed, no matter the civilian death toll. By the same rationale, as many observers have pointed out, Washington and Britain, among others, should be bombed at once by those it has attacked and terrorized, with the hope that innocent civilians are not killed in the process. No sane person would support such measures, which might lead us to wonder why we accept them as justification to decimate Afghanistan.

This question will take on further import as the war on terrorism continues along the course promised to us by its architects, who have made clear that this is to be a "long war", likely to extend to other countries who may support or harbour terrorists. By giving even remote consideration to the effects of just the past few weeks, let alone the long, horrific record of Western military attacks that precede it, these are incredibly disturbing and frightening prospects.

## Coop Bookstore

### Used Booksale a Success

The CSU used booksale went very well. Apart from a few logistical problems that were dealt with as we went along, the process was smooth. Total sales amounted to around \$9000, which allowed us to break even, after paying staff and expenses. Only a few books were stolen or lost, which we reimbursed the students for. We are still holding a few books that haven't been picked up yet, so if you didn't come to get your books they are still available at the CSU office on the 6th floor. We are planning to have a similar sale in January to coincide with the opening of the coop bookstore. Used books that students want to sell will be collected in December to facilitate processing for January.

### Concordia Community Solidarity Coop Bookstore

We are undertaking major renovations in the basement of Reggie's to prepare for the opening of the CSU Coop Bookstore. The legal documents are being processed and the coordinator is working hard to collect support and financial aid from different organizations. Soon Concordia students will have a student run, not-for-profit alternative bookstore.

The coop works on a concept of membership. Students who want to buy books at the coop can become members by filling out an application and paying a small membership fee that is returned upon a request to not be a member anymore. A coop is a form of self management, the members have a direct say in the direction of the coop. Membership provides a person with an automatic discount on almost everything in the store, but also the power to vote in general assemblies and to run for a position on the board of governors. The first General Assembly will be held after the coop receives official accreditation from the Quebec government. This General Assembly is extremely important because we will decide on the founding regulations of the coop. Keep your eyes peeled for posters advertising the date and time. We are confident that this non-profit alternative to the University bookstore will respond to student needs.





# Multiple Choice Is Easy...

*Nortel pulled out of the ECA job fair because:*

- ☐ The high-powered and well-read CSU publication the *UNabridged* briefly mentioned Nortel's profiteering off human misery.
- ☐ They were so disgusted with last year's ECA newsletter *the Frozen Lizard* that they are boy-cotting Concordia.
- ☐ Since Nortel cut tens of thousands of jobs that month, in an attempt to "streamline" their operations, they weren't exactly looking for eager fresh graduates from Concordia.
- ☐ Some kind of conspiracy linked to bin Laden.

...when in doubt we all know to pick C

## Queering Concordia Out Loud

By Marina Tarantini, VP-Resoures

Last month, as part of the CSU's orientation events and in accordance with the Agenda's September theme, we organized a series of activities called OutLoud. For example, the OutLoud Cabaret, which was an amazing night of performance. Students packed Reggie's (our campus bar) and the atmosphere was warm, energizing and loud. As a queer-identified student, it was great to see so many queers in one place ON CAMPUS.

This year's CSU executive was elected with a pro-human rights, activist politic. We did not hide anything about what we were and are, and people responded positively. One layer of what we are is pro-queer. And I don't believe that it is possible to be pro-queer and quiet at the same time.

For me, the expression "OutLoud" reflects that part of my queerness is to demand change. That my queerness is not in my bed with my lover, there's nothing queer between us. The queer is about the outside – the queerness refers to our conditioning and to the fact that we can rarely walk one block, participate in one class, sit through one family event without wincing/grimacing/yelling/kicking at the imbedded heterosexism and homophobia. When I call myself a big dyke, wear pro-queer patches, write about my experiences, and grope my lover in public I am challenging the status quo, telling the straight world to fuck-off, because everyone is better without imposed structures.

**Drag sexual politics onto the streets, and the streets will be safer for it. (chumbawumba)**

We wanted these events to serve as a message of solidarity and a show of presence. The past two years on campus, since I've been here, have been relatively queer-quiet. We were hoping OutLoud would be a sort of launch pad, to inspire people to bring their issues and ideas forward – but at the same time to have some energizing fun, cause I know it can be heaven and hell. I wanna encourage all of queer concordia to yell/scream/kick/laugh and organize – and if you're looking for some help the CSU can be a valuable resource. Come say hello and I can help with organizing an event, starting a campaign, or realizing other exciting ideas.





# CSU Agenda- Process to Process

By Marina Tarantini, VP-Resoures

The immediate purpose of the CSU Agenda is to provide a portable, comprehensible campus and community resource for Concordia students. From union services to university academic info, health awareness to tenant rights, places to go in Montreal to useful maps, its all in the CSU agenda.

Traditionally at Concordia, and for the dedicated people who worked on this year's agenda, and the numerous students and community members who contributed art and words, the CSU Agenda is also about reaching out to fellow students to raise awareness about, and become critical of, their surroundings and the effect of their actions on people locally and globally.

**Past handbooks have created discussion and even controversy, but this year it was louder.**

This year the executive and staff spent a lot of time discussing the process of the CSU agenda. Traditionally, the agenda's content was under the control of the Editor. We decided that we didn't want one person to run the whole show themselves, the more input the better. We came up with a new process that involved an editorial board, a committee of dedicated students and staff, who would make decisions about content. Only financial decision-making power was left with the executive.

We decided that the Agenda Editorial Board would work with the Editor and would have final editorial decision making power. It would be made up of two executives, one council member, one regular CSU staff, all Agenda staff (if they chose to), and at least one more student and one community member. We presented the idea at our first council meeting, and asked councilors to volunteer themselves for this as well as other committees we planned for orientation. We sent emails to the CSU info list encouraging students to get involved. A call out for submissions was made immediately, posters were put all over both campuses and emails were sent to various lists.

When submissions began arriving, the editorial board sat down and created themes which we felt were general issues of great importance on campus: queer issues; labour issues; anti-racism; consumerism; environmental issues; women's issues;

state repression; and media. These themes were not regarded as restrictions and were left open to various topics and submissions. The editorial policy was that we would refuse any submissions that were racist, sexist, homophobic, ableist, or xenophobic. Any other submissions handed in on time and not significantly over the word limit would be published, a standard editorial policy.

Our hope was that this year's agenda would be as diverse as possible, that it would challenge students to become more aware of their environment and their actions, and to give space to issues that are usually marginalized. Past agenda have created discussion and even controversy, but this year it was louder.

B'nai Brith made outrageous accusations in the national media, claiming that this handbook could be used as "a training manual for Bin Laden's youth wing in Canada." The mainstream media's obsession with the Agenda seems to have created a bigger controversy around the agenda than about anything in it.

On Thursday October 11th the CSU held an open meeting to discuss the Agenda. There was an initial discussion, then a series of suggestions for next year's Agenda were given by the students who attended, and then a new editorial collective was struck for next year. The collective will meet to start planning for next year's Agenda, and will look at any suggestions or ideas students have brought forward. If you have some constructive ideas about next year's Agenda or are interested in writing an article, you can send an email to [handbook@csu.tao.ca](mailto:handbook@csu.tao.ca).



## Support for the CSU Agenda

Agenda could be a "blueprint for Osama bin Laden's youth-wing in Canada" put national attention on the CSU Agenda. As much as the agenda has its critics, it also has its supporters. The CSU recieved hundreds of letters of support from around Montreal and around the country. We've decided to reprint just one of those letters here. We are really grateful for the outpouring of support the agenda recieved and couldn't possibly reprint all of the letters here.

October 4, 2001.

Dear Dr. Lowy,

I am writing to protest against the recent attacks against the work of the Concordia Student Union. I first heard about these attacks on CBC radio on Monday, October 1. I found the words of Frank Dimant, Vice President of B'nai Brith, very disturbing. There are people who are trying to use the hideous acts of terrorism in New York and Washington on September 11 as a pretext to clamp down on effective dissent, to increase discrimination against people of Middle Eastern, South Asian and/or Islamic backgrounds, and to further marginalize anyone who would dare express solidarity with the struggles of Palestinians. To hear the B'nai Brith, a human rights organization, playing the role of a leading voice in this attack on human rights made me very angry.

I am a Jewish university professor and I know my standing in Canadian society is the result of the hard battles waged by B'nai Brith and other human rights organizations over time. It seems to me that this history should make us particularly sensitive to the threats of intensified racism and authoritarian clampdowns on dissent. I reviewed the articles from the handbook that the Concordia Student Union made available on the internet and I would have to say that it requires deliberate misinterpretation to find any evidence of anti-semitism in them. Rather, they express a bold spirit of rebellion and a examination of the ways that Palestinian struggles are silenced and marginalized in Canadian society. There may be instances of injudicious language or words I would not choose myself, but that is a topic for democratic discussion and debate, not censorship.

I think it is inspiring to see a student union providing an activist framework for challenging injustices in a world that is growing ever more polarized and unjust. The cynical use of the tragedy of September 11 to shut down the political expression of dissent is very frightening indeed. It is also scary to see the general backlash against people perceived as Arab or Islamic turned into repression against advocates of the rights of Palestinian peoples. I hope that Rector Lowy and the Concordia Administration will not use this moment cynically to attack student political expression. I hope the B'nai Brith will back down from this cynical campaign.

Thank you,  
Alan Sears, PhD  
Associate Professor,  
Department of Sociology and Anthropology,  
University of Windsor  
Windsor, Ontario

cc: Concordia Student Union

B'nai Brith's very serious accusations that this year's CSU

**The UNabridged is a publication of the Concordia Student Union**

Layout and much design by • Margot Brennan

Copy edited by • Marina Tarantini, Dave Bernans, Peter Edleman, & Tom Keefer

Patience maintained by • Our readers

**Vol. 1 • Issue 2**  
October, 2001

Special thanks to: The writers and contributors, especially the ones that got their articles in on time and didn't whine about changes.





In the aftermath of a terrible tragedy,  
people often get upset and angry...

# **DON'T RESPOND WITH racism**

...it's not OK to express your anger  
against someone because of the  
colour of their skin or their religion.

Visit your students' union office to find out how you can  
help put an end to racism and violence on your campus.

If you experience racism or intolerance call 514.931.2377

A MESSAGE FROM THE CANADIAN FEDERATION OF STUDENTS (CFS)